



mindfulbytes

Digital Wellness in K-5

What the Research Says

A Research Summary for Educators

By M.C. Davis

Fellow, Center for Digital Thriving, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Executive Director, New Mexico Center for Cybersecurity and Cyberpsychology Research (NM-CCCR)

MindfulBytes | mindfulbytes.io

A program of NM-CCCR

INTRODUCTION: THE QUESTION WE'VE BEEN ASKING WRONG

For the past decade, the conversation about children and technology has been dominated by one question: How much screen time is too much?

It's the wrong question.

Not because screen time doesn't matter — it does. But because measuring only the quantity of technology use tells us almost nothing about what's actually happening to the child. A child spending 30 minutes video-calling their grandmother and a child spending 30 minutes in an algorithmically-driven content loop are both "getting 30 minutes of screen time." But their bodies, emotions, and brains are having completely different experiences.

The research behind MindfulBytes starts with a different question: How does technology make children feel — in their bodies, in real time?

This guide walks you through the key findings that inform our approach. It's written for educators — not academics.

THE BIG IDEA: INTEROCEPTIVE AWARENESS

Interoception is your ability to sense what's happening inside your body — your heartbeat, your breathing, your stomach, your muscle tension. It's the internal awareness system that tells you "I'm hungry" or "my heart is racing" or "something doesn't feel right."

Interoceptive awareness is the conscious version of that: not just having the signals, but noticing them. Research has consistently shown that interoceptive awareness is foundational to emotional regulation, decision-making, and self-awareness (Craig, 2015; Garfinkel et al., 2015).

When a child feels the pull to keep scrolling, that pull registers in their body before it registers in their mind. The heart speeds up slightly. Breathing gets shallow. There might be a tightness in the chest or a restlessness in the legs. These are the body's real-time signals about the quality of the digital experience — and most children (most adults, too) have never been taught to notice them.

That's the interoceptive awareness thesis at the heart of MindfulBytes: if we teach children to notice what their bodies are telling them during technology use, we give them an early warning system that operates faster than any rule, filter, or screen time limit ever could.

This isn't speculative. Developmental research shows that children's interoceptive awareness can be enhanced through targeted practice (Koch & Pollatos, 2014; Murphy et al., 2019).

Elementary-age children have enough interoceptive capacity to identify and report body signals when given the right vocabulary and structured opportunities to practice.

WHY "HOW MUCH SCREEN TIME" IS THE WRONG QUESTION

The screen-time-as-metric approach has three fundamental problems:

First, it treats all screen time as equal. Research increasingly shows that the type and quality of technology engagement matters far more than the quantity (Livingstone & Helsper, 2023; Orben et al., 2024).

Second, it focuses on the external (how many minutes) rather than the internal (how does the child feel). The child who is deeply engaged in a creative coding project and loses track of 45 minutes has had a fundamentally different experience from the child who passively scrolled through videos for 45 minutes.

Third, restriction-based approaches don't build capacity. A growing body of evidence suggests that screen time limits and content filters, while sometimes necessary, don't teach children the internal skills they'll need to navigate digital environments independently.

MindfulBytes takes the alternative approach: instead of building walls around children's technology use, we build awareness within them.

WHAT THE BODY KNOWS BEFORE THE MIND CATCHES UP

Children's decision-making in digital environments is largely governed by what researchers call satisficing heuristics (Simon, 1956) — the tendency to go with the first option that feels "good enough" rather than deliberately weighing all alternatives.

This is why "think before you click" has limited effectiveness with young children. The thinking happens after the body has already made its call.

This also explains how digital platforms keep children engaged longer than intended. Autoplay features, infinite scroll, and algorithmic content curation are specifically designed to continuously satisfy the "good enough" threshold. When the body never registers "this isn't satisfying anymore," the child never generates the interoceptive signal that would prompt them to stop.

The interoceptive awareness approach addresses this directly. Instead of asking children to think before they act (which comes too late), we teach them to feel what their body is telling them in real time (which comes first).

KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS

- Digital behavioral patterns emerge earlier than we thought.

Research now suggests that meaningful digital habits, preferences, and coping strategies begin crystallizing before age six (Rideout & Robb, 2020; Livingstone et al., 2023).

- Children form attachment-like relationships with technology.

Drawing on attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969/1982; Ainsworth, 1978), our research identifies five Digital Bonding Patterns — distinct ways children relate to their devices.

- Creative capacity is at risk in the AI era.

The emergence of generative AI has introduced a new concern: creative atrophy — the progressive loss of creative generative capacity when a system can create on the child's behalf.

- Not all digital connection is genuine connection.

Relational-Cultural Theory (Miller, 1976) helps us distinguish between digital interactions that foster genuine relational growth and those that simulate connection without the developmental benefits.

- Interoceptive awareness is trainable and transferable.

Children can learn to notice their body's signals during technology use, and this skill transfers beyond the classroom into every digital interaction they'll have.

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOUR CLASSROOM

You are already positioned to make a difference. The shift isn't dramatic. It's:

- From "How long were you on the screen?" to "How did your body feel while you were on the screen?"
- From "It's time to stop" to "What is your body telling you right now?"
- From "Screens are bad for you" to "Screens can feel different depending on what you're doing — let's notice."

These are not large changes to your practice. But they are meaningful changes to how children understand their relationship with technology.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS FOR STAFF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Think about your own screen habits. Can you identify a moment today when your body sent you a signal about your technology use?
- How do your students currently transition into and out of screen-based activities?
- When students report on their technology experiences, what language do they use?
- Which of the five Digital Bonding Patterns do you see most often in your classroom?
- How does your school currently approach digital citizenship and digital literacy?
- Think about the concept of creative atrophy. Are there moments where AI tools are replacing the creative struggle that builds capacity?
- What would it take to pilot a simple body-awareness practice tied to screen time in your classroom for two weeks?

FURTHER READING

Davis, M. C. (2026). Mindfulness as a Service (MaaS) 2.0: Evolving the Framework for Digital Emotional Literacy in K-5 Populations. NM-CCCR.

Davis, M. C., Duffy, P., Elicio, J., and Owen, L. (2023). The Mindfulness as a Service (MaaS) Narrative. Merck Security Solutions.

Key sources cited in this guide: Ainsworth, M. D. S., et al. (1978). Patterns of Attachment. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). Attachment and Loss: Vol. 1. Basic Books. Craig, A. D. (2015). How Do You Feel? Princeton University Press. Garfinkel, S. N., et al. (2015). Knowing Your Own Heart. Biological Psychology, 104, 65-74. Koch, A., and Pollatos, O. (2014). Interoceptive Sensitivity, Body Weight and Eating Behavior in Children. Frontiers in Psychology, 5, 1003. Livingstone, S., and Helsper, E. (2023). Beyond Screen Time. Journal of Children and Media, 17(2), 143-161. Miller, J. B. (1976). Toward a New Psychology of Women. Beacon Press. Murphy, J., et al. (2019). Classifying Individual Differences in Interoception. Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 26(5), 1467-1471. Orben, A., et al. (2024). Windows of Developmental Sensitivity to Social Media. Nature Communications, 15, 1649. Rideout, V., and Robb, M. B. (2020). The Common Sense Census. Common Sense Media. Simon, H. A. (1956). Rational Choice and the Structure of the Environment. Psychological Review, 63(2), 129-138.

MindfulBytes is a program of the New Mexico Center for Cybersecurity and Cyberpsychology Research (NM-CCCR), a 501(c)(3) nonprofit.

Learn more: mindfulbytes.io Research: cyberpsychologyresearch.io Contact: michael@merck.io

© 2026 NM-CCCR. This guide may be freely shared for educational purposes with attribution.

MindfulBytes is a program of the New Mexico Center for Cybersecurity and Cyberpsychology Research (NM-CCCR), a 501(c)(3) nonprofit. Learn more: mindfulbytes.io Research: cyberpsychologyresearch.io Contact: michael@merck.io